

programs. We are convinced that this situation is just as true for other subject-area organizations. The National Council regularly communicates news of professional interest through various mailings and a special newsletter to supervisors and consultants. Such an information exchange is fast and efficient. It reaches not only the state departments but also the districts and the individual schools inasmuch as state supervisors ordinarily have their own channels of intra-state dissemination.

The original intent of categorical state grants for supervisory services was to strengthen instruction by providing state leaders able to cope with the accelerating pace of curriculum revision in subject areas considered vital to the national interest. The importance of such positions is suggested by the multiplicity of duties commonly assigned to state supervisors: initiation and coordination of inservice training programs, assessment and dissemination of pertinent research findings, development of sequential state curriculum guidelines that provide for articulation and continuity at all grade levels, evaluation of existing programs, cooperation with higher education and state agencies on certification requirements, and specialized assistance to teachers and schools on current developments in specific subject areas. Obviously, only a person with considerable knowledge of the subject area concerned can master such an assignment.

Although there are those in education who deplore the movement toward more and more specialization, the most rapid expansion of knowledge man has ever known has made such a move inevitable. Virtually all professions and the disciplines they represent are moving toward more specialization, rather than less. A handful of "Renaissance men" in education may exist in the United States; hardly enough, however, to fill the needs of the state and federal agencies. The professional challenge posed by English alone, in all its aspects of language, composition, and literature, suggests the unlikelihood of a state "curriculum specialist" serving all or several subject areas with equal competence.

The National Council, therefore, views with concern the proposal in Bill H.R. 6232 that amends Title III of NDEA by eliminating all matching support for strengthening supervisory services at the state level in the fields currently considered "critical." We fear that as a result of this, there will be a shift from state subject-area supervisors to those with general educational responsibilities. The National Council does not question the need for those in the latter category. State superintendents, assistant superintendents in charge of education, and curriculum consultants must necessarily be charged with broad educational responsibilities. But it seems obvious that such persons can function best with expert help in major subject areas. To withhold support for these positions represents a reversal of the trend toward close cooperation between subject-matter specialists and professional educators—a trend which in the past decade has been of inestimable value to American education.

Scholars from the disciplines, on college and university faculties, have much to contribute to American education. Whereas in the past too many of them disdained involving themselves with the education of the young, many of them are now deeply engaged in the betterment of programs in mathematics, the natural and social sciences, and the humanities. Twelve to fifteen years ago, there was an undeclared but obvious war between academic specialists and specialists in education. The profession suffered, teachers suffered, and worst of all, children inevitably suffered. An education bill that sets a policy of declassification, of generalization, risks a rupture between these two important groups and jeopardizes the great gains which have come only from their recent harmonious cooperation. It is the National Council's belief that both those in education and those in academic disciplines have substantial contributions to make to American education, contributions unlikely to materialize except in a balanced program encompassing both groups.

Materials and equipment for English teaching

Yet another threat to professional harmony and effectiveness lurks in the proposal to make further cuts in NDEA Title II aid through state education agencies to local schools for the purchase of equipment and supplementary teaching materials. For the most part, purchases under this title have been judicious, if for no other reason than that federal funds must be matched by local funds. The success of this program is indicated by the extensive participation by school districts and the fact that every year there is a backlog of proposed Title